

### EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Scott C Harris on 12/04/2009.

The application has been amended as follows:

#### **IN THE CLAIMS**

1. A method, comprising:  
receiving an electronic mail message in a computer;  
using the computer for displaying information about the electronic mail message;  
using the computer for displaying all of first, second and third controls, where said first control causes the computer to delete the message without indicating whether the message does represent a spam message or does not represent a spam message, the second control causes the computer to delete the message while indicating that it does represent a spam message, and the third control causes the computer to delete the message while indicating that the message does not represent a spam message;  
and  
using the computer for storing a database of spam likelihood, and wherein said deleting using said second and third controls causes changes to information in the

database of spam likelihood, and said deleting using said first control does not cause changes to information in said database of spam likelihood.

2. (Cancelled)
3. A method as in claim 1 wherein said deleting using said second and third controls changes at least one rule in a rules database, and said deleting using said first control does not cause changes of said rules in said rules database.
4. A method as in claim 3 wherein said rules include information about fields from said electronic mail message.
5. A method as in claim 4 wherein said fields from said electronic mail message which are used to change said rules include at least a sender of the e-mail message, text of the e-mail message, and a subject of the e-mail message, and wherein each of said fields are used as parts of rules in said rules database.
6. A method as in claim 5 wherein said fields from said electronic mail message which are used to change said rules also include a domain of a sender of the e-mail message.

7. A method as in claim 3, wherein said fields from said electronic mail message which are used to change said rules include links within the e-mail message, where certain links in an email message represent that the electronic mail message is more likely to represent spam.

8-13 (cancelled)

14. A computer product, comprising a processor and memory storing executable instructions that when executed, implement an email program, said executable instructions comprising: memory, and executable instructions that are adapted to be executed to implement an e-mail program, said product comprising:

an email receiving part that receives emails;

a display output which produces an output which displays a plurality of said e-mails and also displays and accepts input from a plurality of controls including both of:

a first control which selects deleting an e-mail while indicating that said e-mail is spam and reports information indicative of said email to a spam determining database, and

a second control which selects deleting an e-mail while indicating that said e-mail is not spam and reports ~~and does not report~~ information indicative of said email to said spam determining database;

a database update part that adds information indicative of said information reported by said first control and said second control to said spam determining database; and

a spam determining part that analyzes said emails received by said email receiving part based on information in said database as updated by said database update part .

15. A program as in claim 14, wherein said display output displays a likelihood of spam coefficient which indicates a numerical percentage likelihood that the associated message represents spam.

16. A program as in claim 14, wherein said display output further displays a third control which selects deleting an e-mail without indicating or not indicating whether said e-mail represents spam.

17-21 (cancelled)

23. An apparatus, comprising:

a computer which receives an electronic mail message over an electronic channel;

said computer automatically comparing said electronic mail message with information indicative of undesired electronic mail messages; and

said computer producing a user interface that displays information about said electronic mail message, and which user interface allows a selection to all of:

A) delete the message without indicating whether or not the message represents spam,

B) delete the message while indicating that the message does indicate spam, and using information from a first message deleted as spam to change said information indicative of undesired electronic mail messages; and

C) delete the message while indicating that the message does not indicate spam, and using information from a second message deleted as spam to change said information indicative of desired electronic mail messages;

said computer comprising a database of information indicating likelihood of spam, and wherein said delete while indicating that the message does indicate spam changes information in said database and said delete while indicating that the message does not indicate spam changes information in said database.

24. (cancelled)

25. A method as in claim 1 ~~claim 2~~, further comprising using the computer for displaying said spam likelihood as a numerical percentage indicating a likelihood that the message represents spam.

26. A method as in claim 1 ~~claim 2~~, further comprising displaying a message in a color, where the color represents a likelihood that the message represents spam.

27. A method as in claim 3, further comprising using the computer to automatically classify an incoming message as a spam message, or not as a spam message, based on said rules in said database as changed by said first and second controls .

28. A method as in claim 27, further comprising displaying the messages along with an indication of whether they have been classified to represent spam or not to represent spam.

29. A method as in claim 27, further comprising displaying messages that have not been classified to represent spam in a first view, and displaying messages that do represent spam in a second view.

30. A method as in claim 3, wherein one of said fields from said electronic mail message includes a domain of the sender, said domain being used to change said rules in said database.

31. A method as in claim 30, wherein the first rule is changed to represent a higher probability of spam when all senders from a specific domain represent spam, and to

represent a lower probability of spam when some senders from said domain represent spam and other senders from said domain do not represent spam.

32. A method as in claim 3, wherein said changes to said rules in said database uses multiple different techniques to analyze the message and to determine that the message likely represents a spam message.

33. A product as in claim 14, further comprising a display part which displays the messages analyzed by said spam determining part along with an indication of whether they have been classified to represent spam or not to represent spam.

34. A product as in claim 27, further comprising displaying messages that have not been classified to represent spam in a first view, and displaying messages that do represent spam in a second view that is wholly separate from the first view.

35. A product as in claim 14, wherein said database update part uses a domain of the sender to change said rules in said database.

36. A product as in claim 35, wherein the first rule is changed to represent a higher probability of spam when all senders from a specific domain represent spam, and to represent a lower probability of spam when some senders from said domain represent spam and other senders from said domain do not represent spam.

37. An apparatus as in claim 23, further comprising displaying a message in a color, where the color represents a likelihood that the message represents spam.

38. A method as in claim 23, wherein said computer automatically classifies an incoming message as being a spam message, or not being a spam message, based on said information indicative of undesired electronic mail messages as updated by said first and second messages.

39. A method as in claim 38, wherein said computer produces an output that displays the messages along with an indication of whether they have been classified to represent spam or not to represent spam.

40. A method as in claim 38, wherein said computer produces an output that displays the messages that have not been classified to represent spam in a first view, and displaying messages that do represent spam in a second view that is separate from said first view.

41. A method as in claim 38, wherein said information from said first and second messages includes a domain of the sender, said domain being used to change said information indicative of undesired electronic mail messages.



42. method as in claim 41, wherein the first rule is changed to represent a higher probability of spam when all senders from a specific domain represent spam, and to represent a lower probability of spam when some senders from said domain represent spam and other senders from said domain do not represent spam.

43. A method as in claim 38, wherein said changes to said rules in said database uses multiple different techniques to analyze the message and to determine that the message likely represents a spam message.

#### ***Reasons for Allowance***

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The independent claims recite an email program in which the email program contains three delete buttons, each having distinct functionalities, in which upon the actual triggering of deleting the message, these distinct functionalities also occur. The three functionalities include (1) an email delete button that does not indicate whether the chosen email message to delete considered spam or not spam, (2) an email delete button that indicates that the chosen email message to delete is spam and such information is reported to a spam determining database to update information used to determine whether email is spam or not, and (3) an email delete button that indicates that the chosen email message to delete is not spam and such information is reported to a spam determining database to update information used to determine whether email is spam or not.

The prior art disclosed teachings of being able to delete email while such email is being indicated if it is spam, Not spam, or neither through the use of folders (see Horvitz, US 6161130), but at the time of deletion, the spam determining database is not updated. The email has already been categorized at the time of moving the email messages to the folder. The prior art did not explicitly disclose that the triggering of the delete buttons causes the updates to the spam determining database.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J Bret Dennison whose telephone number is (571)272-3910. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on (571) 272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J Bret Dennison/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2443